



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,109	11/03/2000	Scott Nedderman	3553-4074US3	9251

7590 06/16/2004

Walter G. Hanchuk
MORGAN & FINNEGAN LLP
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154

EXAMINER

KANG, INSUN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2124

3

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/708,109

Applicant(s)

NEDDERMAN, SCOTT

Examiner

Insun Kang

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-104 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responding to application papers dated 11/3/2000.
2. Claims 1-104 are pending in the application.

Specification

3. The use of the trademark JAVA, UNIX and ACTIVEX has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 3-6, 9-12, 15-18, 21-24, 26-29, 31-34, 36-39, 41-44, 46, 52, 48-50, 54-56, 58,60-62, 64, 66-68, 70-74,76-80, 82-86, 88-92, 94,95, 97, 98, 100,101, 103 are104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Per claims 3-6, 9-12, 15-18 and 21-24, it is unclear to which validation rules they are referring. They are interpreted as "the validation rules."

Per claims 26-29, 31-34, 36-39 and 41-44, it is unclear to which validation rules they are referring. They are interpreted as "the validation rules."

Per claims 46, 52, 58 and 64, it is unclear to which subclassed validation rules it is referring. It is interpreted as "the subclassed validation rules." It is unclear to which rules library it is referring. It is interpreted as "the rules library."

Per claims 48-50, 54-56, 60-62 and 66-68, it is unclear to which validation rules they are referring. They are interpreted as "the validation rules."

Per claims 70-74, 76-80, 82-86 and 88-92, it is unclear to which validation rules they are referring. They are interpreted as "the validation rules."

Per claims 70-72, 76-78, 82-84 and 88-90, it is unclear to which marked data types they are referring. They are interpreted as "the marked data types."

Per claims 94, 95, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, it is unclear to which validation rules they are referring. They are interpreted as "the validation rules."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 1-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US Patent 6,535,883) herein after referred to as "Lee."

Per claim 1:

Lee discloses:

-receiving information over a communications network ("server computer...confirming data input by a user of the mobile computer," col. 4 lines 5-25)
retrieving validation rules from a rules library stored in a memory device and
determining computer data validity by applying the retrieved validation rules to the information ("In order to ensure the validity of the data entered by the worker, some or all of the fields will have an associated validation rule... for performing one or more tests or comparisons on data in one or more fields to make sure the data is valid...The validation rules are loaded ...and validation rules associated with fields in the rules file are associated ...with the corresponding field names in the MPA. The validation rules test the contents of each field entered by the user to ensure that the field is filled out correctly," col. 2 lines 24-40) as claimed .

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses highlighting information determined to be invalid by the validation rules (see Fig 14) as claimed.

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) as claimed.

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to

a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form,” col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 7-12, they are the system versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 13-18, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claims 19-24, they are the apparatus versions of claims 1-6, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

Per claim 25:

Lee discloses identifying data types requiring validation and providing validation rules stored in a memory device for the associated data types from a rules library (“Sets of validation rules are created for a form interactively, by selecting fields, adding appropriate validation rules to be implemented for the fields, and adding appropriate expressions for the validation rules,” col. 3 lines 19-40) as claimed.

Per claim 26:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are provided to a client ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 27:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are provided to a server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claim 28:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("a set of validation rules for validating data entries made to service provider forms," col. 4 lines 28-41) as claimed.

Per claim 29:

The rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to

a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 30-34, they are the system versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 35-39, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claims 40-44, they are the apparatus versions of claims 25-29, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 25-29 above.

Per claim 45

Lee discloses:

- providing a rules library and an initial parent rule stored in a memory device (The menu presents the expressions as expression templates, which are templates for creating and completing an expression," col. 3 lines 40-54)
- building validation rules by subclassing members of a rules library class hierarchy. ("allows a user to create a validation rule by selecting a template and fill in the blacks," col. 3 lines 50-54) as claimed.

Per claim 46:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses storing subclassed validation rules in a rule library ("enables a user to create a set of form validation rules... Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file," col. Lines 29-41) as claimed.

Per claim 47:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that the subclassed validation rules inherit validation logic from a parent rule (col. 6 lines 54-67) as claimed.

Per claim 48:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are associated with data types (Table 2, col. 11 lines 31-60) as claimed.

Per claim 49:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("receiving data including the input data from the form submitted to a server," col. 2 lines 33-40) ("it is determined whether the input data is valid using information stored in the registry," col. 2 lines 33-44)

Per claim 50:

The rejection of claim 45 is incorporated, and further, Lee discloses that validation rules are executable both on a client and server ("Once created, the validation rules are translated to a rules file 16 (see FIG. 2) and communicated via a wireless network 20 to

a mobile computer 30 for use in validating the data entries made by a mobile worker to an associated form," col. 4 lines 27-41) as claimed.

Per claims 51-56, they are the system versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 57-62, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

Per claims 63-68, they are the apparatus versions of claims 45-50, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 45-50 above.

8. Claims 69-104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Strong (US Patent 6,167,523).

Per claim 69:

Strong discloses:

-marking data types for associated validation rules from a rules library stored in a memory device and providing validation marked data types ("The data...from the form...includes the first registry key identifier...following the FORM declaration...Once the data...is received, the form data validation and processing program...controls data

validation, error reporting and processing of the input data,” col. 7 lines 5-30) as claimed.

Per claim 70:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses:

- building forms with validation rules associated with marked data types (“The data...from the form...includes the first registry key identifier...following the FORM declaration...Once the data...is received, the form data validation and processing program...controls data validation, error reporting and processing of the input data,” col. 7 lines 5-30) as claimed.

Per claim 71:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses storing forms with validation rules associated with marked data types (“the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server,” col. 4 lines 62-67; “The program uses information stored in the registry to determine whether the input data from the form is valid,” abstract) as claimed.

Per claim 72:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses providing forms with validation rules associated with marked data types over a communications network (“the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server,” col. 4 lines 62-67) as claimed.

Per claim 73:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that validation rules are imbedded into a web page("the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server," col. 4 lines 62-67) as claimed.

Per claim 74:

The rejection of claim 69 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that validation rules are executable both on a client and server (col. 5 lines 62-67 and col 6. 1-15) as claimed.

Per claims 75-80, they are the system versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 81-86, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claims 87-92, they are the apparatus versions of claims 69-74, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 69-74 above.

Per claim 93:

Strong discloses:

-identifying browser capability, choosing a validation deployment ("Handlers ... act as "plug-in" modules that can be added to perform any variety of processing tasks... In this manner, data processing support can be easily customized, " col. 10, lines 60-67 and col. 11 lines 1-5) determining if a browser supports regular expressions, and if so, providing validation rules to a client determining if the browser supports non regular expression language, and if so, providing non regular expression language information validation; determining if the browser does not support non regular expression language, and if not, providing regex enabled validation on a server ("The handlers 260 associated with HTML forms to be processed, and the registry 270 including registry keys and subkeys 275 storing configuration and validation information specific to forms to be processed are also stored on the Web Server," col 5 lines 60-67; "The handlers ... may include one or more different handlers for each of the HTML forms 245 that may be accessed by the client PC 200 or another software or hardware client... the handlers 260 may include a different handler for each type of data to be processed," col 5. lines 46-53)

-providing the browser with appropriate network location and validation rules;
obtaining information from a user("The data...from the form...includes the first registry key identifier...following the FORM declaration...Once the data...is received, the form data validation and processing program...controls data validation, error reporting and processing of the input data," col. 7 lines 5-30)

-validating information with appropriate validation rules stored in a memory device storing configuration and validation information specific to forms to be processed are also stored on the Web Server," col 5 lines 60-67) as claimed.

Per claim 94:

The rejection of claim 93 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that validation rules are imbedded into a web page ("the forms data validation and processing control program is stored on the Web server," col. 4 lines 62-67) as claimed.

Per claim 95:

The rejection of claim 93 is incorporated, and further, Strong discloses that validation rules are executable both on a client and server (col. 5 lines 62-67 and col 6. 1-15) as claimed.

Per claims 96-98, they are the system versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Per claims 99-101, they are the computer executable software code versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

Per claims 102-104, they are the apparatus versions of claims 93-95, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 93-95 above.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 703-305-6465. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on 703-305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IK
6/11/2004

Kakali Chaki
KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100